DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 071 SP 010 632

AUTHOR Mayers, Charles D.
TITLE The Relationship of Student Teaching Effectiveness and Satisfaction to the Preferred and Perceived Role of the Cooperating Teacher.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 33p.; Research paper submitted to Association of Teacher Educators, 1975

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperating Teachers; *Effective Teaching; *Participant Satisfaction; *Role Perception; *Student Teachers; Student Teaching; *Teacher Role; Teaching Experience

ABSTRACT

This study examined the effect of the student teacher's perception of and preference for the role of the cooperating teacher and the cooperating teacher's perception of his role on the student teacher's effectiveness and satisfaction with the student teaching experience. Subjects were 98 student teachers and 98 cooperating teachers. Responses were obtained from the student teachers on how they perceived the cooperating teacher performing his role and how they preferred the cooperating teacher to perform his role. Cooperating teachers were asked to indicate how they perceived their role in working with student teachers. Four descriptive models were used to gather these responses from the student teachers and cooperating teachers. Matches and non-matches of both the perception and the preference of the cooperating teacher's role were compared. A nine-point rating scale was used by the cooperating teachers to determine the student teacher's satisfaction with the student teaching experience. It was concluded that how the student teacher preferred or perceived the cooperating teacher's role, when compared to how the cooperating teacher perceived his role, did not have significant effect on how the student teacher was rated at the end of the quarter. Further, comparisons of matches and non-matches did not show any significant differences in the effectiveness of the student teacher or of his satisfaction with the teaching experience. (MM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED131071

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE RELATIONSHIP OF STUDENT TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS AND SATISPACTION TO THE PREFERRED AND PERCEIVED ROLE OF THE COOPERATING TEACHER

A Study Completed

By

Charles D. Mayers

January - March, 1973

SP010 632

An Abstract of

THE RELATIONSHIP OF STUDENT TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS AND SATISFACTION TO THE PREFERRED AND PERCEIVED ROLE OF THE COOPERATING TEACHER

Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study was to examine the effect of the student teacher's perception of and preference for the cooperating teacher's role and the cooperating teacher's perception of his role on the student teaching experience. Matches and non-matches of both the perception and preference of the cooperating teacher's role were compared. Comparisons were also made of the difference in ratings and satisfaction with student teaching scores when the sex of the student teacher and cooperating teacher were considered. A final comparison was carried out to see if grade level—elementary or secondary— made a difference in the effectiveness ratings and/or the satisfaction scores.

Design of the study

Ninety-eight student teachers and ninety-eight cooperating teachers were used during the spring quarter, 1973, in the study. Responses were obtained from the student teachers on how they perceived the cooperating teacher performing his role and how they preferred the cooperating teacher to perform his role. Cooperating teachers were also asked to indicate how they perceived their role in working with student teachers. Four descriptive models were used to gather these responses from the student teachers and cooperating teachers. A nine point rating scale was used by the cooperating teachers to determine student teacher effectiveness. The Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire was completed by the student teachers and used to determine the student teachers' satisfaction with the student teaching experience.

A 4 x 2 x 2 factorial analysis of variance was used to investigate the two independent variables: student teacher effectiveness and student teacher satisfaction. Critical values for F were computed for the three independent variables "groups," "sex," and "grade level," as well as for the interactions that occurred. The .05 level of significance was used to test all hypotheses.

Conclusions of the study

It was concluded in the study that how the student teacher preferred or perceived the cooperating teacher's role, when compared to how the cooperating teacher perceived his role, did not have much affect on how the student teacher was rated at the end of the quarter or how satisfied the student was with the student teaching experience. Only the hypotheses dealing with effectiveness ratings indicated any consistent pattern among the groups studied. In these instances, the matched educator "groups" and/or the non-matched positive "groups" had the highest mean effectiveness ratings. The only factor of the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire on which secondary student teachers scored higher than the elementary student teachers was on the "student teaching load" factor. Females consistently had higher mean scores on the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire and were rated higher by their cooperating teachers. Comparisons of matches and non-matches in the study did not show any significant differences in the effectiveness of the student teacher or his satisfaction with the student teaching experience.

I. NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Introduction

To provide the best teachers possible for children is an intrinsic interest and obligation of both the institutions of higher learning and the elementary and secondary schools engaged in the training of teachers. A paramount professional responsibility of such institutions is that of preparing well qualified persons to teach.

Professional courses in teacher education programs often have been subjected to criticism whereas student teaching has been regarded as so obviously necessary and useful that it has escaped much of this unfavorable attention.[1] Many writers are supportive of the fact that student teaching is the most important aspect of the teacher training program.

In most instances student teaching represents the culminating experience of a preservice teacher education program. It is a time designed to decide who can or cannot handle the responsibilities involved. The importance of student teaching has been emphasized by Meade as he states, "student teaching or clinical training, if that term suits you better, is education's best training device for determining who should be a teacher."[2]

Those persons who have undergone the student teaching experience generally consider it the most valuable of the preservice professional courses and a worthwhile way of learning. Many student teachers, after completing the experience, indicate that it was more valuable to them than all of their other college experience combined. Historically,

---

[1]Garth Sorenson, "What is Learned in Practice Teaching?" The Journal of Teacher Education, XVIII (Summer, 1967), 173.

[2]Edward J. Meade, Jr., "Student Teaching: Many a Slip Between the Cup and the Lip," Research and Professional Experiences in Teacher Education, The Association for Student Teaching Bulletin Number 20 (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, 1963), 25.

student teaching has become continually considered more significant and is spared the vociferous criticisms of reputable commentators. It remains the least challenged area of teacher education.[3] No group authority calls for the deemphasis of student teaching and its continuance and expansion are taken for granted.[4]

In the student teaching experience the cooperating teacher is generally considered as the key figure in working with the college trainee. The apex of the preservice phase of teacher preparation is a point at which a relationship between the student teacher and the cooperating teacher is established. Richards and Robison, in a look at this phase of teacher preparation, see the supervising teacher as the key person in the program of teacher education. It is their opinion that the cooperating teacher determines to a great extent the success or failure of the young student teacher.[5]

Knapp and Bray point out the importance of the cooperating teacher as they state:

> The supervising teacher is without doubt the one with whom he (student teacher) maintains the closer, more continous contact. Because he works with his supervising teacher every day, because he is evaluated both formally and informally, and because his future employment hangs in the balance, it will inevitably be the supervising teacher who wields the stronger, more lasting influence, and from whom he will most likely acquire the attitudes and skills which will serve to enrich or eviscerate his eventual instructional capability. Thus the quality of a new teacher's instruction is influenced in no small way by the quality of the supervisory faculty member assigned to assist him as a student teacher.[6]

---

[3]Harold E. Reynard, "Pre-service and In-service Education of Teachers," Review af Educational Research, XXXIII (October, 1964), 375.

[4]Albert H. Yee, "Interpersonal Relationships in the Student-Teaching Triad," Journal of Teacher Education, XIX (Spring, 1968), 95.

[5]Helen Richards and Elizabeth Robison, "The Supervising Teacher in Teacher Education," The Supervising Teacher, Thirth-eighth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown, Incorporated, 1959), 24.

[6]Dale L. Knapp and Kathleen Bray, "Don't Underestimate the Importance of the Supervising Teacher," Clearing House, XL (October, 1965), 105.

Asking student teachers who the most influential person is in their student teaching experience will probably be answered with "the cooperating teacher". Student teachers recognize the cooperating teacher as the person with whom they interact in a most personalized fashion.[7]

The cooperating teacher is considered as the link in the professional chain who steadies the prospective teacher during his initial period of classroom responsibility. The weakening or breaking of this link means that other persons involved in the chain cannot function properly.

McAulay in his study concluded that "student teachers seem to be greatly influenced by the cooperating teacher." He saw this influence taking place particularly in the areas of methods of teaching, techniques of classroom housekeeping, and relationships with children.[8]

The close working relationship between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher places considerable importance on how well these two people are able to perform their responsibilities jointly. It places considerable importance on how both the student teacher and the cooperating teacher perceive the role of the cooperating teacher. It is possible that the cooperating teacher may perceive his role in one way, but actually be communicating that role in an entirely different manner.

The student teacher is often in a dilemma during student teaching, not only trying to perceive his own role, but also contemplating the actual role being portrayed by the cooperating teacher. The successful cooperating teacher can usually adjust this role to provide gradual and continuous

---

[7]Bernard Rabin, "Who are Supervising Teachers?" The Supervising Teacher, Thirty-eighth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown, Incorporated, 1959), p. 2.

[8]J.D. McAulay, "How Much Influence Has a Co-operating Teacher?" Journal of Teacher Education, XI (March, 1960), 82.

growth for the student teacher. Failure to successfully identify the role of the cooperating teacher and operate accordingly may result in a relationship so poorly defined that no one knows what to do.[9]

One of the questions that can be asked about the cooperating teacher's role is concerned whether it makes any difference if the cooperating teacher operates in a democratic fashion or in a more autocratic role. Such differences in perception of the role have been classified and defined as "open" or "closed" by many writers such as Bills,[10] Rokeach,[11] and Rogers.[12] Emerging from the behavioral sciences, the term "open" person is considered a favorable attribute for good teaching. This person does not rely on authority for solving problems, has no compulsion to force changes, and believes others are deserving of a chance to develop their own abilities as best they can. These marks of an individual could be considered the indications of a good educator. There are also studies that indicate that student teachers do not prefer a completely "free" type of cooperating teacher role. One of these, conducted by Cummins, found that student teachers preferred a guiding role as opposed to a freeing role.[13]

---

[9]Aleyne Clayton Haines, "Role Dilemmas in Student Teaching," Journal of Teacher Education, VIII (March, 1957), p. 366.

[10]R. E. Bills, About People and Teaching (Lexington: Bureau of School Services, University of Kentucky, 1955), p. 28.

[11]M. Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind (New York: Basic Books, 1960).

[12]Carl Rogers, "A Theory of Therapy, Personality, and Inter-Personal Relationships as Developed in the Client-Centered Framework," in Psychology: A Study of Science, ed. by Sigmund Koch (New Yrok: McGraw-Hill, 1959), pp. 184-256.

[13]Robert E. Cummins, "Role Study in Teacher Training: A Sequel," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXXV (November, 1961), 120.

Statement of the Problem

The cooperating teacher and student teacher both perceive a certain role for the cooperating teacher to perform during the student teaching experience. As mentioned above, some cooperating teachers are more "open" and democratic and perform a role as a cooperating teacher educative in nature. Other cooperating teachers are more "closed" and autocratic and operate in a fashion more domineering and instructive. Perhaps the student teacher and cooperating teacher perceive this role in the same way or perhaps in entirely different ways. It is also possible that the student teacher may prefer the cooperating teacher to play a role completely different from the one actually performed.

At the end of the student teaching experience the cooperating teacher is always asked to rate the effectiveness of his student teacher during the quarter. This evaluation becomes a part of the permanent record files of the student teacher and may have considerable influence on his success in obtaining a teaching position.

Sometimes the student teacher may be asked to rate his satisfaction with his student teaching experience at the end of the quarter. Regardless of whether the student teacher is asked to rate the experience or not, in his own mind he does determine how satisfied he has been during the quarter with his student teaching assignment and with the cooperating teacher with whom he has been working.

The first question that this study is asking is, "Does the effectiveness rating of the student teacher or the student teacher's satisfaction with his experience have any relationship to how the cooperating teacher perceived his role when compared to how the student teacher either perceives or prefers that the cooperating teacher carry out his role?" The possibility is suggested that seeing these roles in different ways may have some bearing on the effectiveness rating and the satisfaction with the experience. By comparing matches of both perceptions and preferences with

effectiveness ratings and satisfaction scores answers to the question posed above can be obtained.

A second question relating to the sex of the student teacher can also be asked. Does it make any difference in the performance rating or satisfaction score when comparing preferences and perceptions of the cooperating teacher and student teacher when the sex of the student teacher is considered? This relationship can also be examined by analyzing both matches and non-matches.

A third question involving the grade level of the student teaching experience can also be examined. Does the elementary student teacher differ from the secondary student teacher in either effectiveness rating or satisfaction score when perceptions and preferences of the cooperating teacher's role are compared? The relationship between student teachers at the elementary and secondary levels will be compared.

Hypotheses

As a result of the questions raised above, the following hypotheses were examined for this study:

Hypothesis 1A.—There is no difference between the mean effectiveness ratings of student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role matches the student teacher's perceived cooperating teacher role and those student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role does not match the student teacher's perceived cooperating teacher role.

Hypothesis 1B.—Differences in the effectiveness ratings between the groups of student teachers in 1A above are similar for male or female elementary or secondary student teachers.

Hypothesis 2A.—There is no difference between the mean effectiveness ratings of student teachers whose perceived cooperating teacher role matches the cooperating teacher's perceived role and those student teachers whose perceived cooperating teacher role does not match the

cooperating teacher's perceived role.

Hypothesis 2B.—Differences in the effectiveness ratings between the groups of student teachers in 2A above are similar for male or female elementary or secondary student teachers.

Hypothesis 3A.—There is no difference between the mean effectiveness ratings of student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role matches the cooperating teacher's perceived role and those student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role does not match the cooperating teacher's perceived role.

Hypothesis 3B.—Differences in the effectiveness ratings between the groups of student teachers in 3A above are similar for male or female elementary or secondary student teachers.

Hypothesis 4A.—There is no difference between the mean satisfaction scores for those student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role matches the student teacher's perceived cooperating teacher role and those student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role does not match the student teacher's perceived cooperating teacher role.

Hypothesis 4B.—Differences in the mean satisfaction scores between the groups of student teachers in 4A above are similar for male or female elementary or secondary student teachers.

Hypothesis 5A.—There is no difference between the mean satisfaction scores for those student teachers whose perceived cooperating teacher role matches the cooperating teacher's perceived role and those student teachers whose perceived cooperating teacher role does not match the cooperating teacher's perceived role.

Hypothesis 5B.—Differences in the mean satisfaction scores between the groups of student teachers in 5A above are similar for male or female elementary or secondary student teachers.

Hypothesis 6A.—There is no difference between the mean satisfaction

scores for those student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role matches the cooperating teacher's perceived role and those student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role does not match the cooperating teacher's perceived role.

Hypothesis 6B.—Differences in the mean satisfaction scores between the groups of student teachers in 6A above are similar for male or female elementary or secondary student teachers.

Hypothesis 7A.—There is no difference in the individual factor means on the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire for the "rapport with students" factor, the "rapport with other teachers" factor, the "student teaching load" factor, the "teaching as a profession" factor, and the "rapport with cooperating teacher" factor for those student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role matches the student teacher's perceived cooperating teacher role and those student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role does not match the student teacher's perceived cooperating teacher role.

Hypothesis 7B.—Differences in the individual factor means for the groups of student teachers in 7A above are similar for male or female elementary or secondary student teachers.

Hypothesis 8A.—There is no difference in the individual factor means on the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire for the "rapport with students" factor, the "rapport with other teachers" factor, the "student teaching load" factor, the "teaching as a profession" factor, and the "rapport with cooperating teacher" factor for those student teachers whose perceived cooperating teacher role matches the cooperating teacher's perceived role and those student teachers whose perceived cooperating teacher role does not match the cooperating teacher's perceived role.

Hypothesis 8B.—Differences in the individual factor means for the groups of student teachers in 8A above are similar for male or female elementary or secondary student teachers.

Hypothesis 9A.— There is no difference in the individual factor means on the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire for the "rapport with students" factor, the "rapport with other teachers" factor, the "student teaching load" factor, the "teaching as a profession" factor, and the "rapport with cooperating teacher" factor for those student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role matches the cooperating teacher's perceived role and those student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role does not match the cooperating teacher's perceived role.

Hypothesis 9B.—Differences in the individual factor means for the groups of student teachers in 9A above are similar for male or female elementary or secondary student teachers.

Definition of terms

Some of the terms used in this study have a variety of meanings in educational literature. The following definitions of terms give the meaning applied to each term as it has been used in this document.

Student Teaching.—An intensive and continuous period of "full-day" experience with a given group of learners uninterrupted by campus classes, and where, under the competent guidance of a cooperating teacher and a campus supervisor, many of the major responsibilities in planning and directing the learning process can be carried out.

Student Teacher.—A college student who is acquiring practical teaching experience and skill under the guidance of a cooperating teacher or other qualified person.[14]

Cooperating Teacher.—A regularly employed teacher selected to supervise student teachers who has full responsibility for a group of learners, and to whom a student teacher is assigned for guided pre-service teaching

---

[14]Carter V. Good, Dictionary of Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959), p. 530.

experience.[15] This person is also referred to as a supervising teacher.

Perception.—An awareness of external objects, conditions, and, in this study, relationships with people as a result of sensory stimulation.

Role.—Behavior patterns of functions expected of or carried out by an individual in a given societal context.[16]

Instructor.—One who imparts knowledge, dominates, acts in a directive manner in directing student teacher activities and makes decisions as a cooperating teacher by himself.

Educator.—One who contributes to the development of others a quality of achievement or performance higher than usual, stresses democratic action, allows student teacher to participate in analyzing and determining objectives, materials, and methods used in the classroom.

Extreme.—Utmost or farthest limit or degree, excessive.

Moderate.—Not excessive in degree, within reasonable limits, medium quality.

Open Person.—Positive attitude toward himself and others, changes more readily, concerned with the central aspects of a problem and how he must change, accepts responsibility for his own behavior.[17]

Closed Person.—Apt to hold negative attitudes, deals with small and peripheral aspects of a problem, concerned with how others must change, feels compelled to do what others tell him to do, does not assume responsibility for his decisions.[18]

---

[15]Good, op. cit., p. 539 (definition modified for use in this study).

[16]Ibid., p. 471.

[17]Chester R. Freeze, "On Becoming an Open Supervisor," High School Journal, LIII (March, 1970), 355-356.

[18]Ibid.

Preference.— A favorable evaluation of an object, course of action, end, or in this study, an individual as compared to other possibilities that are rejected. A selection that may be intellectual or emotional in origin, but is always volitional at least in the act of choosing.[19]

Performance.—Actual accomplishment of the student teacher in the classroom as distinguished from potential ability, capacity, or aptitude.

Rating Scale.—Evaluation chart with suggestive points for checking used to compare performance of one student teacher with that of other student teachers or generally accepted standards.

Effectiveness.—Degree to which a student teacher produces and accomplishes the intended or desired results or outcomes expected of a beginning teacher based on a definite scale, objectives, or characteristics considered necessary for a classroom teacher.

Satisfaction.—State or feeling that needs, expectations, desires, and requirements of student teaching have been attained, and doubts and fears about teaching have been alleviated.

Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire.—An instrument designed to measure student morale which is broken down into twelve factors or categories.[20] In this study, it is the instrument used to measure student teacher satisfaction with the student teaching experience.

Importance of the Study

This study should be of importance to various groups or institutions in the planning and placement of student teachers. The decision to match the cooperating teacher and the student teacher has been reviewed in a

---

[19]Carter V. Good, Dictionary of Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959), p. 408.

[20]Ralph R. Bentley and Jo-Ann Price, Manual for the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire (West Lafayette, Indiana: University Book Store, 197c), 1.

number of studies. The need for compatibility is pointed out by Chaltas as he lists a number of writers who see this particular factor as significant.[21] The effect of conflict in the perceptions of the cooperating teacher and the student teacher and the preferences of the student teacher needs to be studied, particularly as they may affect the student teacher's performance and satisfaction. Most studies indicate that matching the cooperating teacher and student teacher would be productive, although Leslie doubts the ability of those people involved to identify the right variables. He suggests that further research in this area is needed.[22]

This study is also important to those institutions responsible for selecting those persons who are to serve as cooperating teachers. Again, if the relationship points out the need for matching perceived or preferred roles for the cooperating teacher, it will be of benefit. In the school system involved in this study the same certificated staff members continually serve as cooperating teachers. If matching or not matching student teacher perception and preferences with the cooperating teacher's perceived role shows differences in student teacher effectiveness or student teacher satisfaction, then those combinations should be selected that give the best results, and the cooperating teachers chosen should be used on the basis of how they combine best with certain student teachers.

With the student teaching experience constantly growing in importance in the teacher education program, efforts to learn as much about the experience and the people involved should continue. This study should be of value in finding out more about the relationship of those persons involved and help the student teaching program function more effectively and more efficiently.

---

[21]John G. Chaltas, "Student Teaching: Assignment and Misassignment," Journal of Teacher Education, XVI (September, 1965), 314.

[22]Larry L. Leslie, "Matching Student Teachers with Cooperating Teachers: A Fruitful Effort?" Journal of Teacher Education, XXII (Fall, 1971), 306.

Limitations of the Study

There are a few limitations in this study that need to be stated. The student teachers involved in this study have been limited to those college students doing their student teaching during the spring quarter, 1973. The school system used is considered a small city, middle class educational operation. No efforts were made to match the student teachers with their cooperating teachers. The combinations used were as assigned by the University's Student Teaching Office.

No effort was made to separate the special area student teachers such as art, music, physical education, or speech and hearing from the student teachers in the academic areas. At the secondary level both student teachers in the academic areas and the vocational areas were included.

The Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire was considered a valid and reliable instrument to measure student teacher satisfaction. The rating scale used to measure student teacher effectiveness was used as a simple measure to gain a comparison of the student teacher's performance as compared to other student teachers with whom the cooperating teacher had worked.

II. METHODOLOGY AND COLLECTION OF DATA

Methodology

The population of this investigation was composed of: (1) 98 student teachers student teaching during the spring quarter, 1973, and (2) 98 cooperating teachers serving as cooperating teachers during the spring quarter, 1973. Fifty-three of the student teachers and cooperating teachers were from the elementary level, K-6. The other 45 student teachers and cooperating teachers worked at the secondary level, 7-12. Thirty-two of the student teachers were male, and 66 were female. Of the cooperating teachers, 27 were male and 71 female. The student teachers were not placed at random, but were assigned as placed by the Director of Student Teaching. All of the student teachers completed the check list indicating their choices of both perceived and preferred cooperating teacher roles from the four descriptive models presented during the eighth week of the eleven weeks of student teaching. The cooperating teachers also completed their check list during the eighth week of the quarter indicating the perception of their role from the same four descriptive models presented to the student teachers. The student teachers completed the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire during the final week of student teaching. The rating scale used to determine student teacher effectiveness was completed by the cooperating teachers during the final week of student teaching.

A preliminary study of the four descriptive roles for cooperating teachers was carried out in early April, 1973, with forty cooperating teachers working with another University. The four descriptive models were presented to them to have them indicate their perception of their role. The purpose of this preliminary study was to test the four descriptive models for clarity and understanding.

Design of the study

The design of this study is a factorial analysis of variance. The

factorial design has become increasingly more popular as evidenced in educational research literature. This type of design permits the effects of two or more independent variables to be studied simultaneously. It is considered high in internal validity. It is economical inasmuch as it permits a single design rather than separate designs for each of the variables. It also provides for the investigating of any interactions that might occur between the variables.[1] The analysis of variance, developed by R. A. Fisher, "is a method for dividing the variation observed in experimental data into different parts, each part assignable to a known source, cause, or factor."[2] The analysis of variance assumes that the "several groups of observations can be treated as random samples from the populations."[3] It also assumes that if the populations differ, the differences are found in the means.

Included in this study are four models describing the role of the cooperating teacher. These models describe the techniques used by the cooperating teacher to carry out his supervisory responsibilities.

The design of this study is a 4 x 2 x 2 factorial analysis of variance. The design is illustrated in Figure 1. The two dependent variables to be investigated simultaneously are student teacher effectiveness and student teacher satisfaction. The three independent variables are groups, grade level, and sex. The variable groups has four levels: matched instructor, match educator, non-matched positive, and non-matched negative. Clarification of these combinations is explained below. For coding purposes, the

---

[1]William Wiersma, Research Methods in Education (New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1969), pp. 234-235.

[2]George A. Ferguson, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), p. 281.

[3]Wiersma, op. cit., p. 86.

		Sex		
		Male A_1	Female A_2	
	Level	Elementary B_1	Secondary B_2	Elementary B_1	Secondary B_2
Groups	Matched Instructor C_1	$A_1B_1C_1$	$A_1B_2C_1$	$A_2B_1C_1$	$A_2B_2C_1$
	Matched Educator C_2	$A_1B_1C_2$	$A_1B_2C_2$	$A_2B_1C_2$	$A_2B_2C_2$
	Non-Matched Positive C_3	$A_1B_1C_3$	$A_1B_2C_3$	$A_2B_1C_3$	$A_2B_2C_3$
	Non-Matched Negative C_4	$A_1B_1C_4$	$A_1B_2C_4$	$A_2B_1C_4$	$A_2B_2C_4$

Figure 1.—4 x 2 x 2 Factorial Design for Groups, Grade Levels, and Sex

extreme instructor role was numbered 1, the moderate instructor role was numbered 2, the moderate educator role was numbered 3, and the extreme educator role was numbered 4. For identification purposes each role was labeled as follows: The extreme instructor—Cooperating Teacher Jones, the moderate instructor—Cooperating Teacher Smith, the moderate educator, Cooperating Teacher Adams, and the extreme educator—Cooperating Teacher Brown. The variable grade level had two levels: elementary and secondary. Elementary level included grades kindergarten through sixth grade. Secondary level included grades seven through twelve. The variable sex also had two levels: male and female.

The matched instructor groups included the following situations:

1. Both the student teacher and cooperating teacher selected the extreme instructor role.

2. Both the student teacher and cooperating teacher selected the moderate instructor role.

3. The student teacher selected the extreme instructor role, and the cooperating teacher selected the moderate instructor role, or the reverse of these selections.

4. The student teacher's perceived and preferred selections were either both the extreme instructor role, or the moderate instructor role, or one of each of the two choices, extreme instructor and moderate instructor.

The matched educator groups included the following situations:

1. Both the student teacher and cooperating teacher selected the extreme educator role.

2. Both the student teacher and the cooperating teacher selected the moderate educator role.

3. The student teacher selected the extreme educator role, and the cooperating teacher selected the moderate educator role, or the reverse of these selections.

4. The student teacher's perceived and preferred selections were either both the extreme educator role, or the moderate educator role, or one of each of the two choices, extreme educator and moderate educator.

The non-matched positive groups included the following situations:

1. The cooperating teacher perceived himself as an instructor, but the student teacher perceived the cooperating teacher as an educator.

2. The cooperating teacher perceived himself as an instructor, but the student teacher preferred the cooperating teacher role of an educator.

3. The student teacher perceived his cooperating teacher in an instructor's role, but he preferred a cooperating teacher in an educator's role.

The non-matched negative groups included the following situations:

1. The cooperating teacher perceived himself as an educator, by the student teacher perceived the cooperating teacher as an instructor.

2. The cooperating teacher perceived himself as an educator, but the student teacher preferred the cooperating teacher role of an instructor.

3. The student teacher perceived his cooperating teacher in an educator's role, but te preferred a cooperating teacher in an instructor's role.

The 4 x 2 x 2 factorial design gives sixteen cells to be used in this study. The sixteen cells include the following: (1) elementary male matched instructor, (2) elementary female matched instructor, (3) elementary male matched educator, (4) elementary female matched educator, (5) elementary male non-matched positive, (6) elementary female non-matched positive, (7) elementary male non-matched negative, (8) elementary female non-matched negative, (9) secondary male matched instructor, (10) secondary female matched instructor, (11) secondary male matched educator, (12) secondary female matched educator, (13) secondary male non-matched positive, (14) secondary female non-matched positive, (15) secondary male non-matched negative, and (16) secondary female non-matched negative.

In dealing with the analysis of variance, it will be necessary to determine F ratios between groups, between grade levels, and between sex. Interaction F ratios are needed for Grade Level x Sex, Grade Level x Groups, Groups x Sex, Grade Level x Sex x Groups, plus the within sum of squares.

Instruments used in the study

To find a way for student teachers and cooperating teacher to examine the role of the cooperating teacher, four descriptive models of the cooperating teacher's role were prepared. These four models were used to portray the following four types of cooperating teachers: (1) extreme instructor, (2) moderate instructor, (3) moderate educator, and (4) extreme educator. The four descriptions were to range from the cooperating teacher who is quite authoritative and domineering to the one who is more permissive and democratic in his role. For purposes of this study the extreme instructor was labeled Cooperating Teacher Jones, the moderate instructor was named Cooperating Teacher Smith, the moderate educator was titled Cooperating Teacher Adams, and the extreme educator was listed as Cooperating Teacher Brown.

Cooperating Teacher Jones is considered in the extreme instructor role. This cooperating teacher believes he must direct each move the student teacher makes. His philosophy might be described as follows: "Student teaching is a time for the cooperating teacher to pass on his knowledge and experience to the student teacher, in order for the student teacher to adopt a similar approach and philosophy to teaching."

Cooperating Teacher Smith is considered the moderate instructor type who is willing to give the student teacher some freedom, but still expects to control many of the classroom responsibilities being carried out by the student teacher. This cooperating teacher's philosophy might be described

as follows: "Student teaching is a time for the cooperating teacher to use his knowledge and experience to guide the student teacher in finding approaches that both the cooperating teacher and student teacher agree are feasible for the student teacher."

Cooperating Teacher Adams is considered the moderate educator type who maintains some control over the student teacher, but also permit the student teacher to make some of his own decisions during the quarter. His philosophy could be described as follows: "Student teaching is a time for the student teacher to examine the cooperating teacher's approached and then, with the guidance of the cooperating teacher, sort out and use alternatives that best fit the student teacher's personality."

Cooperating Teacher Brown is considered the extreme educator type who permits the student teacher to make many of his own decisions, with guidance, but feels no need to direct each move that is made. His philosophy might be described as follows: "Student teaching is a time for the student teacher to discover his own procedures and teaching styles, and for the cooperating teacher to be available for guidance when desired by the student teacher."

These four descriptions have been written to include the same basic ideas in each, but varied to fit the type of role suggested by the above labels. The descriptions are all of approximately the same length. The models were not presented to the cooperating teachers in the order presented here, but scrambled in order to break up any continuity that might be detected in reading one model after the other.

The second instrument used in this study consisted of a rating scale dealing with student teacher effectiveness. A nine point scale was devised for the cooperating teachers to check their evaluation. One (1) on the scale was considered low, five (5) as average, and nine (9) as high. The

cooperating teachers compared the effectiveness of their present student teacher with other student teachers with whom they had worked. It was necessary for them to place a check mark above the number on the scale which most closely rated the effectiveness of their student teacher. A description of marks made at points 1, 5, and 9, was stated on the check sheet for their guidance. These descriptions were as follows:

1 - Student teacher ranks in lowest ten per cent of all student teachers I have worked with as a cooperating teacher. Numerous conflicts were evident in the relationship with both pupils and cooperating teacher. There was difficulty in obtaining results in the classroom.

5 - Student teacher ranks as about average of all student teachers I have worked with as a cooperating teacher. The student teacher was able to work with both the pupils and the cooperating teacher. The results obtained in the classroom would be classified as average.

9 - Student teacher ranks in highest ten per cent of all student teacher I have worked with as a cooperating teacher. Student teacher was highly effective in working with pupils and established an excellent relationship with both the pupils and the cooperating teacher. Excellent results were obtained in the classroom.

These descriptions were deemed adequate to permit the cooperating teachers to distinguish where their present student teachers belonged on the scale.

The third instrument used in this study was the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire. The instrument was designed to measure student teacher morale and, specifically in this study, student teacher satisfaction. The Opinionaire is divided into twelve factors which break student teacher morale into some of its dimensions. As stated in the Manual, "the Purdue Student-

Teacher Opinionaire provides valid and reliable information about the nature of morale problems which concern student teachers."[4] It can be used to make comparisons among student teachers grouped by grade levels, subject matter areas, and school settings. The Opinionaire is useful in investigating these concerns as it permits insights to be gained into ways of assisting student teachers and, hopefully, improving teacher education programs.[5]

In this study, only five of the twelve factors have been used. The five factors included are: rapport with students, rapport with other teachers, student teaching load, teaching as a profession, and rapport with the cooperating teacher. These five factors make up a total of 49 items of the 100 included in the Opinionaire. There are four possible answers that could be selected by the student teachers. These include: agree, possibly agree, possibly disagree, and disagree. The scoring of individual items is accomplished in the following manner: (1) When "agree" is the keyed response (a positive item), the weights are as follows: agree—4, possibly agree—3, possibly disagree—2, disagree—1, and (2) when "disagree" is the keyed response (a negative item), the weights are as follows: agree—1, possibly agree—2, possibly disagree—3, and disagree—4. Scoring can be handled either by hand or by computer.[6]

Collection of the data

The data for this study were collected in a number of ways. The materials for the preliminary study of the descriptive roles by the forty cooperating teachers were distributed by mail. The four descriptive roles,

---

[4]Ralph R. Bentley and Jo-Ann Price, Manual for the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire (West Lafayette, Indiana: University Book Store, 1972), p. 1.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Ibid, p. 7

a letter of introduction, and the instruction sheet were mailed to each cooperating teacher. The names of these cooperating teachers and their addresses were taken from a cooperating university's mailing list.

After concluding that the four descriptive models were satisfactorily designed, the models were submitted, with slight revisions, to the cooperating teachers and student teachers. Meetings were scheduled with all of the student teachers and cooperating teachers within each building for this purpose. These meetings were conducted by the writer. A separate letter of introduction to the study was given to each student teacher and cooperating teacher. They were assured that their responses would remain confidential. An instruction sheet, with blanks for checking their responses, was handed to them along with the four descriptive models of cooperating teacher roles. Each person was also given an envelope in which to place their instruction sheet after completion. The sealed enveloped were collected and tabulated by the writer.

During the last week of student teaching, the writer met with each group of student teachers to administer the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire. Form A was used to measure student teacher satisfaction. The student teachers were given as much time as needed to respond to the 100 items. They were asked to respond to all of the 100 items, although only 49 were actually used in this study. The responses were made by the student teachers on the form itself by circling the answers of their choice. Student teachers returned the completed Form A in a sealed envelope provided for this purpose. The results of the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire were calculated and totaled by the writer for the averages needed, and a score for each of the student teachers on each factor was figured. In addition, an average score for the 49 items answered for use in this study was also

computed. A grand mean for each factor, for all student teachers, was calculated along with a grand mean for the composite scores of all student teachers.

The cooperating teachers were asked to check the rating scale provided during the final week of student teaching. Individual contacts were made with each cooperating teacher. The cooperating teacher was given a letter of explanation of the purpose of the rating scale, and instruction sheet which included the rating scale, and an envelope in which to return the rating scale and to guarantee confidentiality. The results from the rating scales were tabulated and recorded by the writer. A grand mean for effectiveness was calculated for all student teachers. All of the cooperating teachers returned their rating scales.

An IBM card was prepared which included an identification number for each student teacher, his sex, his grade level, his rapport with students mean score, his rapport with other teachers mean score, his student teaching load mean score, his teaching as a profession mean score, his rapport with the cooperating teacher mean score, the composite five factors mean score, his effectiveness rating, his choice of preferred cooperating teacher role, his choice of perceived cooperating teacher role, and his cooperating teacher's perceived role.

Three sets of IBM cards were prepared because of the following three possible combinations: (1) student teacher preference and student teacher perception, (2) student teacher perception and cooperating teacher perception, (3) student teacher preference and cooperating teacher perception. The computer program used to analyze the data submitted was a BMD05V. The materials were tested at the computer center at the University's computer center.

III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The only hypothesis dealing with "groups" where significance was found occurred with the "rapport with cooperating teacher" factor on the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire between student teachers whose perceived cooperating teacher role matched their preferred cooperating teacher role and those student teachers whose perceived cooperating teacher role did not match their preferred cooperating teacher role. The matched educator group scored significantly higher than either the matched instructor group or the non-matched positive group. Thus, those student teachers who perceived and preferred a more "open" role for the cooperating teacher scored higher than those student teachers who perceived and preferred a more "closed" role, or whose preferences and perceptions did not match. No other null hypothesis proposed for "groups" in the study was rejected.

Differences in effectiveness ratings and satisfaction scores, when comparing elementary and secondary student teachers, were not significant for any of the proposed hypotheses except for the "rapport with cooperating teacher" factor of the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire where the student teachers' preferred role for the cooperating teacher was compared to the cooperating teachers' perceived role. In this situation, elementary student teachers scored significantly higher than the secondary student teachers. No other null hypotheses pertaining to "grade level" were rejected.

Differences in effectiveness ratings and satisfaction scores, when comparing male and female student teachers, were significant frequently throughout the study. A significant difference was found in the effectiveness ratings and the composite satisfaction scores for those student teachers

whose preferred cooperating teacher role matched the student teacher's perceived cooperating teacher role and those student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role did not match the student teacher's perceived cooperating teacher role. In these instances, the female student teachers had mean ratings and scores higher than the male student teachers. Other null hypotheses dealing with effectiveness ratings were tenable.

Differences in satisfaction scores for male and female student teachers were also found for student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role matched the cooperating teacher's perceived role and those student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role did not match the cooperating teacher's perceived role. These differences were significant for the composite satisfaction scores on the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire and for two of the individual factors, "teaching as a profession" and "rapport with cooperating teacher."

In addition, several of the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire factors were significant when comparing those student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role matched the student teacher's perceived cooperating teacher role and those student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role did not match the student teacher's perceived cooperating teacher role. These factors included the "student teacher load" factor, the "teaching as a profession" factor, and the "rapport with cooperating teacher" factor.

In all of the hypotheses above, pertaining to differences between mean scores for male and female student teachers, the female student teachers scored significantly higher than the male student teachers. No other null hypotheses on "sex" differences were rejected.

Significant interactions were prevalent throughout the study. There was no significant interactions when the effectiveness ratings were examined. Significant interactions between "grade level" and "sex" were found when

comparing those student teachers whose prferred cooperating teacher role matched the student teacher's perceived cooperating teacher role and those student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role did not match the student teacher's perceived cooperating teacher role. These differences occurred on the composite satisfaction scores and the "rapport with cooperating teacher" factor. Significant interactions were also found when comparing those student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role matched the cooperating teacher's perceived role and those student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role did not match the cooperating teacher's perception. These differences were found for the composite satisfaction scores on the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire as well as the "teaching as a profession" factor and the "rapport with cooperating teacher" factor.

Interactions in several situations in the study were significant between "grade level," "sex," and "groups." These interactions occurred when comparing student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role matched the student teacher's perceived cooperating teacher role and those student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role did not match the student teacher's perceived cooperating teacher role. The specific hypotheses included the composite satisfaction scores, the "rapport with students" factor, and the "rapport with cooperating teacher" factor. In addition, significant interactions were found for "grade level," "sex," and "groups," for student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role matches the cooperating teacher's perceived role and those student teachers whose preferred cooperating teacher role did not match the cooperating teacher's perceived role. Interactions occurred for the composite satisfaction scores, the "rapport with students" factor, and the "rapport with cooperating teacher" factor, None of independent variables were able to remain constant over the levels of the other variables. In many instances, the affect of a dependent variable varied as different combinations of the levels of the three independent variables were examined.

A general conclusion that can be observed throughout the study is that it does not appear to make much difference in the effectiveness ratings, composite satisfactions scores, or individual factor scores on how the student teacher preferred or perceived the cooperating teacher role when compared to the cooperating teacher's perception. Non-matches in perception would seem to produce conflict, but in only one situation in the study did it make any difference.

A second general conclusion would be that the differences in elementary and secondary student teacher effectiveness ratings and satisfaction scores were similar. Again, a difference appeared in only one instance. One might assume that elementary student teachers would be more satisfied. As a result, they would receive higher ratings, but this was not generally true in the study. In examining the mean scores themselves, it is shown that the elementary student teachers had higher mean ratings and higher mean satisfaction scores throughout the study except for one factor of the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire. When examining the "student teacher load" factor, it was found that the secondary student teachers' mean scores for this factor were higher than the elementary student teachers' mean scores. Apparently, the only place the secondary student teachers were more satisfied than the elementary student teachers with their student teaching experience was with the student teaching load. It might be speculated that the elementary student teachers spent more time in preparing for student teaching than did the secondary people. Since, on the elementary level, teachers are expected to prepare daily for different subject areas such as reading, mathematics, science, and social studies, the elementary student teachers may have found their preparation time quite extensive. On the secondary level, student teachers are generally expected to plan for no more than two preparations. As a result, the secondary student teachers may have found their student teaching load more satisfactory.

Generally, it is assumed that female effectiveness ratings and female satisfaction scores in student teaching will be higher than the male student teachers. In all cases throughout the study, this assumption was supported as the mean female scores and ratings were higher than the mean male scores and ratings.

In one situation, a general conclusion can be made about the "groups" being considered. The hypotheses dealing with effectiveness ratings indicated that either the matched educator "group" or the non-matched positive "group" had the highest mean rating, while either the matched instructor "group" or the non-matched negative "group" had the lowest mean rating. This relationship was as expected since the matched educator and non-matched positive "groups" were designed with the intent of being a more compatible interaction between student teacher and cooperating teacher than the matched instructor or non-matched negative "groups."

In summary, how the student teacher prefers or perceives the cooperating teacher's role when compared to how the cooperating teacher perceives the role does not appear to have much affect on how the student teacher is rated at the end of the quarter or how satisfied the student teacher is with the student teaching experience. Differences in elementary and secondary student teacher ratings and satisfaction scores, overall, were similar. Only in the area of "sex" were there consistent differences and, in all instances, the female student teachers had higher mean scores on the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire and higher effectiveness ratings than did the male student teachers.

The results of this study would support those researchers who do not believe matching the student teacher and cooperating teacher is worthwhile. Differences in perceiving the role of the cooperating teacher did not appear to have any affect on the two dependent variables: satisfaction and effectiveness. Therefore, attempts to match the student teacher and cooperating teacher on their perception of the cooperating teacher's role, or to match the student

teacher's preference of the cooperating teacher's role with the cooperating teacher's perception of his role, would be fruitless and unnecessary on the basis of the study.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are suggested for further research on the perception of the cooperating teacher's role and its effect during the student teaching experience:

1. Since there are other people involved in the student teaching experience, the perception of the cooperating teacher's role by the clinical supervisor, principals, or students, could be matched with either the student teacher's or cooperating teacher's perception.

2. Changes in the perception of the cooperating teacher's role, by the student teacher, from the beginning of student teaching to the end of student teaching could be measured against effectiveness and satisfaction.

3. Matching cooperating teacher and student teacher perceptions of the cooperating teacher's role could be done prior to student teaching and then its effect on the rating and satisfaction could be determined.

4. The type of community in which the student teacher has his experience could be examined for differences in perception of the cooperating teacher's role.

5. The perception of the cooperating teacher's role, by the student teacher and cooperating teacher, could be compared to their attitudes toward students and teaching.

6. A different instrument could be developed and used in a repeated study to measure the perception of the cooperating teacher's role.

7. A different rating scale and a different instrument to measure satisfaction could also be used in a repeated study.

8. Since this study was done in only one school system, groups of student teacher could be used from different school systems for a similar study.

Many of these recommendations seem appropriate and feasible to be incorporated into future studies. Continual research is needed to help develop a better understanding of what happens during the student teaching experience in order to improve the teacher education process conducted in the schools.